

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-3, 5-8, and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gourlay (WO 02/078101). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for the following reasons.

Independent claim 1 recites an organic electroluminescent display device including, in part, “a second connection electrode structure connected to the first pad, the second connection electrode structure being the same as the first connection electrode structure.” In contrast to Applicants’ claimed invention and as acknowledged by the Final Office Action, Gourlay explicitly discloses a first electrode 8 and a second electrode 12. Specifically, Gourlay explicitly discloses on page 8, for example, that the first electrode 8 is a transparent electrode, such as ITO, and that the second electrode 11 consists of a thin layer 12 of reactive low work function ( $<4$  eV) metal, or metal compound such as lithium fluoride. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Gourlay is completely silent with regard to “a second connection electrode structure connected to the first pad, the second connection electrode structure being the same as the first connection electrode structure,” as required by independent claim 1, and hence dependent claims 2-11.

For the above reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn because the applied art does not teach or suggest the novel combination of features recited in independent claim 1, and hence dependent claims 2-11.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendment and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

By: \_\_\_\_\_



David B. Hardy  
Reg. No. 47,362

Dated: October 6, 2005

**CUSTOMER NO. 09629**  
**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**  
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Telephone: (202) 739-3000